1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	In re
10	JEANNE PASLE-GREEN, No. 03-12842
11	Debtor(s).
12	JEANNE PASLE-GREEN,
13	
14	Plaintiff(s),
15	v. A.P. No. 04-1011
16	EDUCATIONAL CREDIT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,
17	Defendant(s).
18	
19	Memorandum of Decision
20	
21	Debtor and plaintiff Jeanne Pasle-Green obtained a humanities-related Ph.D. in 2000, at the age
22	of 61. Now 65, she has been unable to obtain any employment in her field and is working part-time as a
23	cashier at a book store for \$7.50 an hour. She also receives Social Security payments of \$736.00 per
24	month, allowing her to maintain a minimal standard of living with no discretionary income available for
25	debt repayment. In this adversary proceeding, she seeks discharge of her student loans on grounds of

undue hardship pursuant to § 523(a)(8) of the Bankruptcy Code.

Based more on her age and observation of her physical and emotional frailty in court than on anything in her testimony, the court is convinced that Pasle-Green is incapable of repaying her student loans and still maintaining a minimal standard of living and that this state of affairs is likely to persist for into the foreseeable future. This satisfies the first two prongs of the three-part test for undue hardship. *In re Marks*, 308 B.R. 436, 443 (9th Cir. BAP 2004). If not for the third prong, the court would order the student loans discharged without need for further analysis.

The third prong requires the debtor to demonstrate that she has made good faith efforts to repay the loans. The court bridles at having to impose this test on the debtor, as it is the worst of judge-made law. Not only does past effort to repay the loans have nothing whatsoever to do with present hardship, but Congress knows how to draft a good faith provision if it wanted one. See, e.g., § 1129(a)(3) and § 1325(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code. Nonetheless, the court is obliged to follow the law as it is, and not as the court thinks it should be.

Pasle-Green has never made any payments on her student loans. However, her un-controverted testimony is that she has never been able to do so. She has kept the lender informed of her address and has applied for deferments. Since this is all she has been capable of, the court declines to interpret the third prong as requiring payment. The court finds it sufficient that she has done all she is capable of doing.

For the foregoing reasons, the student loans will be discharged. A separate judgment will be entered. This memorandum constitutes the court's findings and conclusions pursuant to FRCP 52(a) and FRBP 7052.

Dated: September 1, 2004

Alan Jaroslovsky U.S. Bankruptky Judge